

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt® PUBLICATION

MARCH 2016

EDITOR'S NOTE: OPPORTUNITIES

Steven A. Meyerowitz

OPPORTUNITIES IN DERIVATIVES FOR COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL BANKS

Juan M. Arciniegas and Daniel O'Rourke

ACCOUNTABILITY ON THE RISE FOR BANK OFFICERS— IMPLICATIONS OF THE NYDFS AML PERSONAL LIABILITY PROPOSAL

Kevin Petrasic, Helen Lee, and Katherine Lamberth

CHANGES NEEDED TO PROTECT THE BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR WHEN DEALING WITH THE MEDICAL MARIJUANA INDUSTRY—PART II

Moises Gali-Velazquez

SECOND CIRCUIT AFFIRMS MANDATORY SUBORDINATION OF UNDERWRITERS' CONTRIBUTION AND REIMBURSEMENT CLAIMS

Michael L. Cook

CREDITOR PARTICIPATION IN THE RECAPITALIZATION OF THE GREEK BANKING SYSTEM—PART I

Yiannis Bazinas and Yiannis Sakkas

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Matthew T. Burke at (800) 252-9257

Email: matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

Fax Number (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-8020-4 (eBook)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

ISSN: 2381-3512 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Sheshunoff is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2016 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Office
630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

Barkley Clark
*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street
LLP*

John F. Dolan
*Professor of Law
Wayne State Univ. Law School*

David F. Freeman, Jr.
Partner, Arnold & Porter LLP

Thomas J. Hall
*Partner, Chadbourne & Parke
LLP*

Satish M. Kini
*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton
LLP*

Douglas Landy
*Partner, Milbank, Tweed,
Hadley & McCloy LLP*

Paul L. Lee
*Of Counsel, Debevoise &
Plimpton LLP*

Jonathan R. Macey
*Professor of Law
Yale Law School*

Stephen J. Newman
*Partner, Stroock & Stroock &
Lavan LLP*

Bimal Patel
*Counsel, O'Melveny & Myers
LLP*

David Richardson
Partner, Dorsey & Whitney

Heath P. Tarbert
Partner, Allen & Overy LLP

Stephen B. Weissman
Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP

Elizabeth C. Yen
Partner, Hudson Cook, LLP

Regional Banking Outlook
James F. Bauerle
*Keevican Weiss Bauerle & Hirsch
LLC*

Intellectual Property
Stephen T. Schreiner
Partner, Goodwin Procter LLP

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2016 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form— by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise— or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258 (phone). Material for publication is welcomed— articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only

the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave, New Providence, NJ 07974.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

Second Circuit Affirms Mandatory Subordination of Underwriters' Contribution and Reimbursement Claims

*By Michael L. Cook**

*The author of this article discusses the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit decision in *In re Lehman Brothers Inc.*, which affirmed the subordination of the underwriters' contribution and reimbursement claims.*

“Claims arising from securities of a debtor’s affiliate should be subordinated” to all other “senior or equal” claims in the debtor’s bankruptcy case, held the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on December 14, 2015 in *In re Lehman Brothers Inc.*¹ Relying on Bankruptcy Code (“Code”) Section 510(b), the Second Circuit affirmed the lower courts’ mandatory subordination of contribution and reimbursement claims asserted by junior underwriters “held to account for the . . . losses” incurred by holders of notes issued by the debtor’s affiliate and parent, Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. (“Holdings”), a Chapter 11 debtor. Lehman Brothers Inc. (“LBI”), the debtor here, was the lead underwriter of its affiliate’s notes and was the subject of a liquidation under the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (“SIPA”), “essentially a bankruptcy liquidation.”² In short, the court rejected the underwriters’ argument that “because the . . . [affiliated parent’s] securities were not . . . part of LBI’s waterfall, § 510(b) did not apply to [their] claims.”³ “[I]n the affiliate securities context,” reasoned the court, “the claim . . . represented by” a security that must be subordinated “means a claim . . . of the same type as the affiliate security.”⁴

RELEVANCE

According to the Second Circuit, “[e]very other court that has applied § 510(b) to claims based on affiliate securities—when the debtor was a

* Michael L. Cook is a partner in the New York office of Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP where he devotes his practice to business reorganization and creditors’ rights litigation, including mediation and arbitration. He may be contacted at michael.cook@srz.com.

¹ *In re Lehman Brothers Inc.* (2d Cir. Dec. 14, 2015).

² *Id.* at n.2, quoting *In re Adler Coleman Clearing Corp.*, 195 B.R. 266, 269 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1996).

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

corporate entity—has required subordination.”⁵ Code Section 510(b) provides in relevant part that “a claim . . . for damages arising from the purchase or sale of . . . a security [of the debtor] *or of an affiliate of the debtor* . . . or for reimbursement or contribution . . . shall be subordinated *to all claims or interests that are senior to or equal to the claim* . . . represented by such security” (emphasis added).

According to the Fifth Circuit in *American Housing Foundation*, Section 510(b) “serves to effectuate one of the general principles of corporate and bankruptcy law: that creditors are entitled to be paid ahead of shareholders in the distribution of corporate assets.”⁶ This mandatory subordination clause “applies whether the securities were issued by the debtor *or by an affiliate of the debtor*.”⁷ Thus, “claims arising from equity investments in a debtor’s affiliate should be treated the same as equity investments in the debtor itself—i.e., both are subordinated to the claims of general creditors.”⁸

In *Lehman*, the underwriters’ contribution and reimbursement claims were deemed to have arisen out of the noteholders’ purchase of securities (notes) issued by LBI’s parent/affiliate, Holdings.

FACTS

The facts in this case “are undisputed.”⁹ Between 2004 and 2008, LBI was the lead underwriter for 22 offerings of Holdings securities totaling \$32.4 billion. A December 2005 Master Agreement between LBI and the junior underwriters governed their relationship and “created a right of contribution among [them] for losses or liabilities resulting from securities fraud claims arising out of the [Holdings] offerings.”¹⁰

After Holdings sought Chapter 11 relief and LBI commenced its SIPA case in September 2008, “investors in . . . [Holdings] notes” sued the junior underwriters for securities fraud, “alleging material misstatements and omis-

⁵ *Id.* citing, among others, *In re Am. Hous. Found.*, 785 F.3d 143 (5th Cir. 2015) (creditors’ guaranty claim “arising from equity investments in a debtor’s affiliate should be treated the same as equity investments in the debtor itself—i.e., . . . subordinated to the claims of general creditors”).

⁶ *Id.* at 153, quoting *In re American Wagering Inc.*, 493 F.3d 1067, 1071 (9th Cir. 2007).

⁷ *Id.*, quoting A. Resnick & H. Sommer, 4 *Collier on Bankruptcy* ¶ 510.04 [04] (16th ed. 2014) (emphasis added).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *In re Lehman Brothers Inc.*, *supra* note 1.

¹⁰ *Id.*

sions in the offering documents.” They did not sue LBI, however, because of its pending SIPA case. According to the junior underwriters, “they collectively incurred almost \$78 million in the defense and settlement of” the claims asserted by the Holdings investors. As a result, the junior underwriters filed general creditor claims against LBI in its SIPA case, asserting “rights to contribution for their losses” under the terms of their agreement with LBI and under the Securities Act of 1933. The SIPA Trustee objected to the claims, asserting that they “were subject to mandatory subordination” under Code Section 510(b).¹¹

The underwriters argued that their claims shouldn’t be subordinated “because the securities were issued by LBI’s *parent*, rather than LBI.”¹² They conceded that Section 510(b) “expressly applies to securities issued by ‘affiliate[s],’ and that it requires . . . such claims [to] ‘be subordinated to all claims . . . that are senior to or equal the claim[s] . . . represented by such securit[ies].’ ”¹³ They argued, however, that their claims were not based on their ownership of Holdings securities and that LBI owned no securities issued by Holdings. “In other words, . . . because the . . . Holdings-issued securities were not otherwise part of LBI’s waterfall, § 510(b) did not apply to” the contribution claims they asserted against LBI.

The bankruptcy court rejected their arguments, and ordered the underwriters’ claims to be subordinated to the claims of LBI’s other unsecured creditors. It reasoned that the contribution “claim[s] . . . represented by” the Holdings securities were “general unsecured claims, connected in subject matter to the underlying securities.”¹⁴

The district court affirmed on a different ground. Instead, it “focused on the type of security rather than on the type of claim,” reasoning that “any ambiguity in the [Code] lies not in *whether* claims based on securities of an affiliate are to be subordinated but *how* that subordination is to occur.”¹⁵ The district court thus held that “unsecured, non-equity securities [—like the notes issued by Holdings—] . . . represent unsecured claims, meaning that claims involving such securities must be subordinated to [other] general unsecured claims.” With affiliate securities, reasoned the district court, “the type of security dictates the

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.* (emphasis in original).

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*, quoting 503 B.R. at 784–85, 787.

¹⁵ *Id.*, quoting 519 B.R. at 449–51 (emphasis in original).

level of subordination whether or not that security represents an actual claim in the debtor's case."¹⁶

THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Adopting the district court's analysis, the Second Circuit agreed with the subordination of the underwriters' contribution claims. Because the claims arose from the affiliate's issuance of the security (i.e., the notes), the underwriters' unsecured contribution claims were "of the same type as the underlying securities" issued by Holdings, LBI's affiliate.¹⁷

Applying the terms of Section 510(b), the court also found that the contribution claims asserted by the underwriters are "represented by such security."¹⁸ It explained that "[i]f the security is an unsecured debt instrument, the claim that is represented by that security is a general unsecured claim."¹⁹ Because "claims relating to affiliate securities . . . are expressly included" in Section 510(b), subordination here was mandatory. The court thus rejected the underwriters' argument that "the phrase 'claim . . . represented by such security' [must] mean a claim . . . *based on ownership of* such security in this' case."²⁰

The legislative history of Section 510(b), said the court, further supported its analysis. First, "Congress expressly included claims based on affiliate securities."²¹ Also, "Congress further expanded § 510(b)'s reach in 1984, with the addition of claims for reimbursement and contribution."²² Finally, case law in the Second Circuit and elsewhere "endorses a 'broad' interpretation of" Section 510(b).²³

In sum, the securities of Holdings, the debtor's affiliate, provided "the basis for the claim[s] asserted by the Underwriters."²⁴ "Congress has already determined that" the "risk-allocation rationale" [i.e., the different risk and

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*, quoting 4 *Collier on Bankruptcy* ¶ 510.04[1] (16th ed. 2009).

²⁰ *Id.* (emphasis in original).

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*, citing *In re Med Diversified, Inc.*, 461 F.3d 251, 255, 259 (2d Cir. 2006); *In re Telegroup, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 133, 135–36 (3d Cir. 2002).

²⁴ *Id.*

return expectations of investors and creditors] supported the subordination of the underwriters' unsecured contribution claims here.

COMMENT

The *Lehman Brothers* decision is consistent with the Second Circuit's own precedent and decisions by other federal courts of appeals. At bottom, the underwriters' contribution claim is rooted in the losses sustained by noteholder investors in the debtor's affiliate.²⁵

²⁵ *Med Diversified*, 461 F.3d at 246 (claims subordinated; issue was "whether a claim for fraudulent inducement and breach of contract for failure to issue common stock in the debtor in exchange for the plaintiff's shares in another company was one 'arising from' an agreement to purchase or sell a security"; reading "arising from" broadly, *held* claimant took on "risk and return expectations of a shareholder" because he "bargained not for cash but to become a stockholder in the debtor"); *Telegroup*, 281 F.3d at 142 (claims subordinated; arose from breach of agreement to use best efforts to register stock; claimants were "equity investors seeking compensation for a decline in the value of" the debtor's stock; although claimants never intended to buy a long-term stake in debtor, claims subordinated because "claimants retained the right to participate in corporate profits" of debtor; Code Section 510(b) prevents claimants from using breach of contract claim to recover value of equity investment "in parity with general unsecured creditors"); *In re Geneva Steel Co.*, 281 F.3d 1173, 1180 (10th Cir. 2002) (subordinated claim for fraud; shareholder deceived into holding and not selling his securities; claimant sought to shift losses onto creditors; fraudulent retention claim based on "a risk only the investors should shoulder"); *In re Betacom of Phoenix, Inc.*, 240 F.3d 823, 830 (9th Cir. 2001) (subordinated claim arising from breach of obligation to deliver stock under merger agreement; "investors and creditors have different expectations"; investor has "greater financial expectations" than a creditor).